UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,472	02/18/2004	Jonathan Dale	073338.0135 (02-53312 FLA	4871

5073   7590   07/30/2009
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
MCCORMICK, GABRIELLE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/782,472	DALE, JONATHAN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gabrielle McCormick	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 July 2009</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,4-9,12-17 and 20-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1, 4-9, 12-17 and 20-25</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   This action is in reply to the amendment filed on July 6, 2009.

2.   Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, 20 and 25 have been amended.

3.   Claims 2-3, 10-11 and 18-19 have been canceled.

4.   Claims 1, 4-9, 12-17 and 20-25 are currently pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 6, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.   Claims 1, 4-9, 12-17 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

8.   Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 contain limitations requiring the determination of "whether the service provider is satisfactory based on if the service descriptors satisfy at least a portion of the business function requirements". The specification provides:

9.   Pg. 2: For each of the identified service providers, the method communicates with the service provider to determine feature interfaces for interacting with the service provider, accesses at least one of the feature interfaces of the service provider to determine service descriptors describing a service provided by the service provider, and determines whether the service provider is satisfactory based on if the service descriptors satisfy at least a portion of the business function requirements. The method also ranks each of the satisfactory service providers based on the service descriptors from each of the satisfactory service providers.

10.   Pg. 13: For example, for a particular materials supply request, description 44 may include a number of request specific descriptors indicating preferences, constraints, and other suitable types of information for interacting with and judging supply services.

11.   Further, claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 contain limitations requiring "ranking each of the satisfactory service providers based on the service descriptors from each of the satisfactory service providers". The specification provides:

12.   Pg. 19-20: For example, the business function description may include specific criteria that must be satisfied in order for particular services **18** to be considered. If services **18** remain, organization agent **22** ranks the matching services **18** according to appropriate criteria at step **124** . For example, in the purchasing context, organization agent **22** may arrange various product bids based upon cost, delivery time, and other suitable criteria.

13.   The specification does not provide any further detail as to how a service provider is deemed "satisfactory" or how ranking is accomplished. The disclosures of preferences and constraints appear to indicate that some factors may be weighed positively and others negatively in determining satisfaction and ranking, however, the specification does not provide the algorithms that would be used in such a case. Further, as preferences and constraints are assessed differently by different people or organizations, a plethora of choices exists that could comprise criteria for judging a supplier. Applicant's claims are directed to broad concepts defined by examples and generalities, with an infinite variety of possible evaluations of satisfaction and rankings to be assigned in an infinite variety of ways and used in an infinite variety of calculations. Applicant has not defined any means to determine a provider as "satisfactory" or to rank those that are satisfactory. Thus, the Examiner asserts that specification does not provide sufficient guidance and direction to one skilled in the art to make and use applicant's invention without undue experimentation.

14.   Applicant cites a section of the specification on pg. 10 and asserts that the cited section provides the means to determine a provider as satisfactory and the means to rank, however, the cited section does not discuss any determination of satisfaction nor any ranking means and therefore the argument is not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

15.   Claim 9 additionally claims an "organization agent operable to...establish an organization database...". The specification does not provide a disclosure for how an "agent" establishes a database. As a result of the lack of direction provider by the inventor and lack of a working example, the disclosure would require undue experimentation and therefore does not satisfy the enablement requirement.

16.   Applicant cites a section of the specification on pg. 8; lines 15-19 and asserts that enablement is provided for how an "agent" establishes a database. The Examiner disagrees. The cited portion does not even mention a database, much less how an agent establishes one. The Examiner understands that the database maintains information, however, Applicant's invention is directed to automated management, and therefore the specification does not adequately provide enablement for the establishment of the database by the agent. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

17.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

         The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
         claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

18.   Claims 9 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

19.   Claim 9 discloses a system with "an organizational agent", however, it is unclear whether the organizational agent is operable to provide the communication, access, determination and ranking steps associated with the service providers. The system components or structure is not claimed such that one understands the structure required to carry out these steps. The operation of the organization agent is defined by method type steps rather than by structure. As a result,

the claim purports to be both a system and a process and is therefore ambiguous. Claims 12-16

depend from claim 9 and are rejected.

20. Applicant asserts that the plain and ordinary meaning of the phrase "organization agent" is

sufficient to overcome the rejection and points to sections of the specification that describe what

the organization agent does (maintains information, handles discovery and interaction). Applicant

additionally asserts that the claim language of "an organization agent coupled to the service

providers and the service registry using a communication network" makes the phrase clear to one

of ordinary skill in the art.

21. The Examiner disagrees. The citations and arguments provided are not sufficient to overcome

the lack of structure or system components in the claim necessary to demonstrate how the

organization agent is operable to perform the steps of communication, access, determination and

ranking associated with the service providers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

22. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

23. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to non-statutory

subject matter.

24. Claims 1 and 4-8 are method claims that recite process steps that are not tied to another

statutory class, such as a particular apparatus. Based on Supreme Court precedent (*Diamond v.*

Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook,* 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v.*

Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972) and *Cochrane v. Deener,* 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) and

recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such

as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or

materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the

method is not a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 2-8 are rejected through their dependency to rejected claim 1.

25. Applicant's argument regarding that the process is patent-eligible because it performs transformations during negotiation and ranking is not persuasive. Negotiation and ranking include prioritizing and ordering data such as price and delivery dates, however, the data has not been changed (i.e., transformed) into a different state or thing, therefore, no "transformation" exists. In *Bilski*, the court stated (pg. 25):

> The raw materials of many information-age processes, however, are electronic signals and electronically-manipulated data. And some so-called business methods, such as that claimed in the present case, involve the manipulation of even more abstract constructs such as legal obligations, organizational relationships, and business risks. Which, if any, of these processes qualify as a transformation or reduction of an article into a different state or thing constituting patent-eligible subject matter?
> Our case law has taken a measured approach to this question, and **we see no reason here to expand the boundaries of what constitutes patent-eligible transformations of articles**.

26. Therefore, Applicant's argument regarding the limitations of claim 1 does not satisfy the transformation test.

27. 35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, *or* composition of matter, *or* any new and useful improvement thereof". Applicant's claims 9 and 12-16 are directed to a system, however, recite as part of the system "a plurality of service providers". As service providers encompass human beings, they are not a statutory class of subject matter and therefore are not patent eligible subject matter. "If the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed invention as a whole encompasses a human being, then a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 must be made indicating that the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter." (MPEP; 2105).

28. Applicant has argued that service providers does not encompass human beings and points to the specification at pg. 6; lines 14-17. The Examiner contends that this passage can be interpreted to encompass human beings. For example, "Service providers 12 offer machine readable interfaces". This can be understood to be a human service provider with a web site. The

Examiner further maintains that service providers can be understood to encompass human

beings and cites pg. 9; line 25: "service providers 12 register their services 18 with one or more

service registries 24." One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a human being would

perform the registration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

29.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

30.   **Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-15, 17, 20-23 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Das et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0023499, hereafter referred to as "Das") in view

of Vashistha et al. (US Pub. No. 2001/0051913, hereafter referred to as "Vashistha").

31.   **Claims 1, 9, 17 and 25:** Das discloses

- *a plurality of business function requirements;* (P[0047]: "short or long term strategic

  purchasing policy rules")

- *accessing a service registry of a plurality of service providers;* (P[0065])

- *for each of the identified service providers:*

- *communicating with the service provider to determine feature interfaces for interacting with

  the service provider;* (P[0025]: the Network is the medium for communication links between

  devices and computers; P[0026]: servers provide data and applications to clients; P[0027]:

  Internet is gateway for communication. It is inherent in communicating via the Internet

  between purchasers and sellers (i.e., a service provider) that interfaces for interacting with

  the service provider are communicated); P[0050]: "services" are identified, therefore, service

  providers comprise the vendors of P[0066]; P[0043]: vendor selection and price negotiations

are made automatically, thus feature interfaces for interacting with the service provider are inherent in the network-based system)

- *accessing at least one of the feature interfaces of the service provider to determine a plurality of service descriptors describing a service provided by the service provider;* (P[0068] negotiations are conducted using the internal rules and parameters where price and time that a product is needed are factors that are negotiated, therefore, in order to negotiate around these factors, the service provider must at least have service descriptors that disclose pricing and availability. P[0050]: parameters, including price, quantity, delivery times and quality measures are used to negotiate the purchase from sellers, therefore, negotiation involves determining descriptors provided by the provider. P[0052]: vendors are compared based on price and quality, thus, price and quality are disclosed as descriptors.)

- *determining whether the service provider is satisfactory based on if the service descriptors satisfy at least a portion of the business function requirements;* (P[0047]: rules include rank ordering for calculating tradeoffs among different product or vendor attributes and rank ordered lists of preferred vendors (i.e., satisfactory) and P[0052]).

- *negotiating a plurality of variable service descriptors* (P[0050]: Das discloses parameters for negotiating the purchases from sellers using variable service descriptors, including price, quantity, allowable substitutions, order size and delivery times)

- *ranking each of the satisfactory service providers based on the service descriptors from each of the satisfactory service providers.* (P[0047]: rules include rank ordering for calculating tradeoffs among different product or vendor attributes (i.e., service descriptors) and rank ordered or weighted lists of preferred vendors.)

- authorizing performance of the service (P[0073]: purchase order is transmitted to selected supplier, thus a third feature interface is inherent in the transmission of the PO.).

32. Das does not explicitly disclose whether a feature interface is a first, second or third, however, Das discloses an automated system over a network, such as the Internet, that includes vendor selection (determination of service descriptors describing a service is inherent in vendor

selection); negotiation (P[0043]) and transmission of a PO (authorization) (P[0073]). Whether a feature interface is first, second or third is **nonfunctional descriptive data** and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. **The determination of service descriptors, negotiation and authorization would be performed regardless of the description of the interface.** Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack,* 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry,* 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

33.   Das does not explicitly disclose e*stablishing an organizational database maintaining at least one business function description comprising a business function indicator; using the business function indicator to identify a network address for each service provider each having a service indicator matching the business function indicator.*

34.   Vashistha, however, discloses a registration module for buyers and providers that includes a buyer (i.e., organizational) database. Buyer and supplier profiles are entered such that the outsourcing system can suitably match buyers and providers, therefore, it is obvious that a business function indicator is disclosed that enables identification of the provider. (P[0036]); Buyers can be a department or entity within a company (P[0031]), therefore each entity will have a *business function indicator* such as the name of the department. Further, Vashistha discloses RFPs with requirements and specifications (i.e., *business function requirements*) (P[0037]: "categories of the outsourcing elements captured within the RFP module can include various types...", thus the RFP module stores this data. The matching module uses data and criteria from buyers to match to data captured from providers so to identify only those providers meeting a minimum level of matching. (P[0038]: this discloses the functionality of determining a satisfactory level based on business function requirements where the provider is identified by the business function description. A service provider's network address is identified such that notification of qualified providers can be made via e-mail (P[0038]).

35.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included an organizational database using business function indicators to

identify a network address for each provider, as disclosed by Vashistha in the system disclosed

by Das, for the motivation of providing a method that "enables buyers, i.e., companies that need

IT projects and/or services implemented and completed, to obtain end-to-end knowledge and

support to initiate, decide and implement IT projects and services with providers..." (Vashistha;

P[0029]). Das discloses the system and methodology for automatically making operational

purchasing decisions in a data network using purchasing rules that evaluate possible vendors to

identify a set of vendors from which the product or service may be obtained, with a final selection

for purchase from one or more vendors using rules, information about the vendors and the results

of negotiations. (Das; P[0013]). Therefore, both Vashistha and Das aim to accomplish the

objective of matching buyers and providers using rule based decision making systems and

methodologies, thus it is obvious to expand Das to include the features of Vashistha.

36.   Das does not disclose ranking based on the negotiations (and therefore ranking doesn't include

the negotiated plurality of variable service descriptors).

37.   Vashistha, however, discloses ranking bids (P[0066]) following a discussion and bidding module

which provides a mechanism for facilitating the collaboration between buyers and providers to

obtain an improved understanding of the RFP, thus ranking follows negotiation.

38.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to have included ranking prior to final selection, as disclosed by Vashistha, in the system of Das

for the motivation of selecting a provider. Ranking is an old and well known form of aiding

decision making and Das discloses that the selection may be based on the results of the

negotiation, as well as other factors where the lowest price is not necessarily the basis for

selection. (Das; P[0080]). By scoring and ranking, as disclosed by Vashistha, these other factors

are accorded a role in the automated decision making process of Das. It then becomes obvious

to authorize performance of a service as disclosed by Das (P[0073]) by the highest ranking

service provider. Das discloses authorizing the "selected" seller. The combination with Vashistha

to rank makes it obvious that the selected seller would also be the highest ranking.

39. **Claims 4, 12 and 20:** Das discloses a plurality of deal parameters and a negotiation threshold (i.e., "maximum acceptable price") (P[0047-0048]) and performing a negotiation via a "back-and-forth sequence of offers and counteroffers" where each counteroffer is compared to rules to determine acceptability. (P[0068]).

40. **Claims 5, 13, and 21:** Das provides notification/authorization by transmitting purchase orders to the selected vendors. (P[0073]) but does not disclose a highest ranking provider.

41. Vashistha, however, discloses ranking bids (P[0066]) following a discussion and bidding module which provides a mechanism for facilitating the collaboration between buyers and providers to obtain an improved understanding of the RFP. (P[0064]. Vashistha also discloses providing a qualified list of providers following scoring and ranking, thus providing a notification identifying the highest ranking provider. (P[0063]).

42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included ranking prior to final selection, as disclosed by Vashistha, in the system of Das for the motivation of selecting a provider. Ranking is an old and well known form of aiding decision making and Das discloses that the selection may be based on the results of the negotiation, as well as other factors where the lowest price is not necessarily the basis for selection. (Das; P[0080]). By scoring and ranking, as disclosed by Vashistha, these other factors are accorded a role in the automated decision making process of Das.

43. **Claims 6, 14 and 22:** Das discloses retrieving a list of known vendors and additionally querying a directory to find new vendors to add to the list (P[0065]). Vendors are then negotiated with (P[0068]) until a selection is made and a purchase order transmitted (P[0073]). Das does not disclose a highest ranking between current and satisfactory service providers.

44. Vashistha, however, discloses matching buyers to both providers the buyer currently uses and with a global network of providers where both buyers and providers are notified. (P[0038]). Vashistha further discloses providers are scored and ranked and the results provided in a qualified list of providers. (P[0063]). It is inherent in ranking that a highest ranking provider is identified, and therefore a notification of such is generated with the qualified list in P[0063].

45.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a highest ranking, as disclosed by Vashistha, in the system of Das for the motivation of for the motivation of selecting a provider. Ranking is an old and well known form of aiding decision making and Das discloses that the selection may be based on the results of the negotiation, as well as other factors where the lowest price is not necessarily the basis for selection. (Das; P[0080]). By scoring and ranking, as disclosed by Vashistha, these other factors are accorded a role in the automated decision making process of Das.

46.   **Claims 7, 15 and 23:** Das provides notification/authorization by transmitting purchase orders (i.e., organization information) to the selected vendors. (P[0073]).

47.   <u>Claims 8, 16 and 24</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Das et al. (US Pub. No. 2003/0023499, hereafter referred to as "Das") in view of Vashistha et al. (US Pub. No. 2001/0051913, hereafter referred to as "Vashistha") in further view of Chun et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0184527, hereafter referred to as "Chun").

48.   **Claims 8, 16 and 24:** Das/Vashistha discloses the limitations of claims 7, 15 and 23. Das discloses evaluating vendors to identify a set of vendors from which a service can be obtained. (Abstract). Das does not disclose payroll management, employee, payment or banking information.

49.   Chun, however, discloses that businesses outsource payroll management (P[0004]) that includes the exchange of data relating to human resources and payroll. (P[0025]). Data and information relating to employees, salaries (i.e., payment) and banking are inherently comprised in the data disclosed.

50.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included payroll management and data, as disclosed by Chun, in the system of Das for the motivation of providing an example of a service providing vendor.

Response to Arguments

51.   Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 2009 regarding the prior art rejections have been fully
considered but are not persuasive.

52.   Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach establishing an organizational database and
argues that the Examiner relies on inherency to disclose this teaching in Vashistha.

53.   The Examiner disagrees and points to P[0036] of Vashistha where it is disclosed that the
registration module captures profile data for buyers and sellers that include numerous data
elements, such as general buyer and seller information, a providers domain knowledge, expertise
(i.e., business function indicator) and skills (i.e., business function requirements). The buyer and
seller profiles are maintained in databases.

54.   Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach determining a plurality of feature interfaces. The
"feature interfaces for interacting with service providers" are inherently comprised in the networked data
processing system (P[0025-0026]) that result in the determination of descriptors (P[0059]), the negotiation
(P[0061]) and the authorization to perform the service (P[0073]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should
be directed to Gabrielle McCormick whose telephone number is (571)270-1828. The examiner can
normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (5:30 - 4:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John
Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this
application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/G. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629